

REMARKS

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed December 8, 2004. By the present amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 1, 5-7, and 18. It is respectfully submitted that the claims now pending in the application, namely claims 1-18, do not introduce new subject matter, are fully supported by the application, and are patentable over the prior art. Prompt and favorable consideration of these claims is earnestly sought.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 2-5 of U.S. Patent No. 5,730,748 to Fogarty et al. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) and the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d). It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-7 has been overcome.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-3 of U.S. Patent No. 5,853,417 to Fogarty et al. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) and the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d). It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-18 has been overcome.

The Office Action rejected claims 1 and 6-18 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type of double patenting over claims 1-11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,899,913 to Fogarty et al. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) and the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d). It is respectfully submitted that

Appl. No. 10/790,373
Amdt. dated February 14, 2005
Reply to Office Action Mailed December 8, 2004


the Office Action's obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1 and 6-18 has been overcome.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-7 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-7 of U.S. Patent No. 6,527,787 to Fogarty et al. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c) and the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d). It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's obviousness-type double patenting rejection of claims 1-7 has been overcome. In response thereto, Applicants hereby submit a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.321(c). Please charge the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) to Deposit Account **21-0550**. **TWO (2) COPIES OF THIS SHEET ARE ENCLOSED.**

Prompt and favorable action on these claims, namely claims 1-18, is earnestly requested. Should the Examiner desire a telephonic interview to resolve any outstanding matters, he is sincerely invited to contact the undersigned at (631) 501-5713.

Respectfully submitted,

Carter, DeLuca, Farrell & Schmidt, LLP
445 Broad Hollow Road - Suite 225
Melville, New York 11747
Tel.: (631) 501-5713
Fax: (631) 501-3526


Dana A. Brussel
Reg. No. 45,717
Attorney for Applicants

Send correspondence to:
Chief Patent Counsel
Tyco Healthcare Group
150 Glover Avenue
Norwalk, CT 06856